**CHABOT COLLEGE ACADEMIC/FACULTY SENATE**

**Board Room, Building 200**

**Thursday, November 10th, 2005 – 2:20 p.m. to 4:55 p.m.**

**APPROVED MINUTES**

Submitted by Stephanie Zappa

**Senator Attendance:** Applied Technology & Business (Michael Absher); Counseling (Sally Stickney & TBA); Health, Physical Education, & Athletics (Nancy Cowan & Ross Shoemaker); Arts & Humanities (William Johnson); Language Arts (Stephanie Zappa & Francisco Zermeño); Library (Norman Buchwald); Science & Mathematics (Dave Fouquet & Ming Ho); and Social Sciences (Barbara Ogman & Michael Thompson).

**Guests:** Dr. Ron Taylor (Vice President, Academic Services), Ashnita Narayan (ASCC), Brigitte Kouakou (Student Trustee), Luis G. Coindres (Applied Tech. & Business) interested in being part-time faculty senator, and Anne Brichacek (Computer App. System, Applied Tech. & Business) interested in being alternate part-time faculty senator.

**Presiding Officers:** President Chad Mark Glen, Vice President Michael Absher.

**ITEM**

**1.0 GENERAL FUNCTIONS**

**1.1 Call to Order:** President Glen called the meeting to order at 2:20 p.m.

**1.2 Approval of the Minutes:** Michael Absher moved to approve the Minutes of October 27, 2005 and Barbara Ogman second. The motion carried.

**2.0 REPORTS**

**2.1 College President.** Dr. Robert Carlson gave a report on budget cuts, referring to the memo he sent out early this week (dated: 11/7/05). Using the report from KH Consulting, the Chancellor’s Cabinet has been meeting and will be making decisions about how and where to cut $1.2 million from Chabot's budget. More detail will follow as they continue to meet. ■Faculty should talk to deans who will take their concerns forward to the president or vice president(s).

■Cuts will occur in the 2006-07 academic year, but any cuts than can be made in spring of 2006 may ease that strain; we may be able to spread the cuts over two years. ■Chad Mark Glen asked who comprises the Chancellor’s cabinet; President Carlson responded, the presidents and vice presidents of both colleges
and a couple of “key” people from the district. ■Bill Johnson asked about the work of the various disciplines as well as the Senate involving three processes: the unit plans, enrollment management, and the four-semester, approved Program Revitalization/ Discontinuance Process, and wondered whether “our work was in vain.” President Carlson said the cabinet is looking at unit plans as part of their information to make decisions. Bill Johnson pointed out that unit plans are not due until December 9, yet decision regarding cuts will occur by December 1. Dr. Carlson said this is really the second year that faculty has been working on unit plans; they are using our discipline plans from last year. Glen asked for clarification of the differentiation between unit and discipline plans. Dr. Carlson said they are following the recommendations of IPBC and decided the unit/program review documents should be “morphed” into one document. ■Glen pointed out that Dave Fouquet had raised concerns from the Faculty Association about the workload and asked Fouquet to clarify. Fouquet referred to Article 29 of the Faculty Contract, and said that as long as the procedure spelled out there is followed, that would be acceptable. He also said the CEMC is a contract committee, but IPBC is not. ■Brigitte Kouakou asked the president for clarification: would four committees put their ideas to the chancellor’s cabinet? Dr. Carlson stated that data from KH would be used to make decisions, but the Board of Trustees will make final decisions. ■Brigitte Kouakou added that a few months ago at a board meeting she learned that the board sometimes allocates more money than is needed because the school needs it for hiring. Dr. Carlson said any discipline could still rewrite their plans, or ask for full-time faculty hires if they want, but he cannot say at this point whether they can be considered. ■Michael Thompson asked about the deficit, and the numbers as they are related to the district: if total debt is approximately $5,000,000, how will the district office itself make cuts? Dr. Carlson responded that the district plans to cut $600,000, LPC is expected to cut $750,000; district cuts will affect ITS and various services that affect both campuses. Dr. Carlson explained that he made various recommendations for cuts at the district level, e.g. the two business managers (one for each college) could merge to one position (among others), but won’t know specifics until decisions are made in three weeks. ■Dave Fouquet asked about specific numbers: if last year we had a $4 million deficit, which ended being $2.5 million in “real” numbers this year, why can’t we continue to rely on carryover, as we have in the past? Dr. Carlson responded, “Your doubts about the real numbers cloud the seriousness of the issue.” He then explained again (as he had at our first senate meeting in September) that the carryover has lessened each year and that former carryover is gone. Dave Fouquet said he has studied the budget and understands the concept (as well as the reality) of the carryover, but numbers don’t seem to match the current scenario from the chancellor. Dr. Carlson said those doubts “can’t be addressed” because the committee will ultimately work with the numbers they have. Dave Fouquet wants to review those numbers; Dr. Carlson said that’s fine. President Glen recommended moving the agenda forward (it was 3:15 pm). ■Dr. Carlson wanted to respond to Bill Johnson’s question about the senate’s recent work on the Program Revitalization and Discontinuance
Process. Dr. Carlson explained that the four-semester process is too long for the current crisis; and the process approved by the senate is intended for future cuts of programs. He said that the process is being followed, since it states that the chancellor may override the four semesters. (Note that language states chancellor may “suspend the timeline … due to a recognized fiscal crisis.”) Dr. Carlson added that he believes the work of the senate is meaningful.

2.2 ASCC. Brigitte Kouakou (Student Trustee) said that at their last meeting, the chair of community relations announced plans for more promotion and marketing for the ASCC; plans include a donations drive in December. ■ Vice President Ashnika Narayan specified: they will decorate Building 200 for the holidays on the last day of November; a comedy night; two performances in the cafeteria of local artists’ and a breakfast, lunch, and dinner held for students.

2.3 CLPFA. Shari Jacobsen reminded faculty to vote on the MOU for part-time seniority by November 17; some senators said they had not yet received ballots (which will be provided). ■ The FA special meeting held on November 1 to discuss benefits in light of current contract negotiations was well-attended. Tom DeWit and Dave Fouquet informed faculty about the negotiations process and as of now both sides are still “far apart.” ■ The next meeting will be held on November 17 in Room 1904 and Jacobsen encouraged all to attend. The negotiations process is critical and faculty input is important. ■ Dave Fouquet continued the report, reminding faculty that four years ago as part of the process Friday morning workshops were held to help faculty prioritize their input for negotiations and more of these will be scheduled in early spring. ■ The FA has hired a consultant to help review options in various benefits programs. ■ The new salary schedule will be available next week and Fouquet has an article in the newsletter to explain recent pay raises and the retroactive process; faculty are encouraged to read it and questions could be addressed at the next FA meeting. ■ Bill Johnson asked whether we as faculty can be assured that negotiations are being carried out in good faith; given the current budget crisis, he asked about the possibility of a contract being stalled. Dave Fouquet said the contract formula is still in effect from the last negotiation process, and it is in the district’s interest to arrive at a contractual agreement.

2.4 Public Comments: None.

3.0 ACTION ITEMS

3.1 Student Cheating- Report and Resolution Outline Michael Absher moved to approve the amended Student Cheating- Report and Resolution Outline and Nancy Cowan second. The motion carried. Mike Absher suggested adding the Board Policy statement to that back of the form; he also wanted to add “Names and student(s)...” under the student section of report (as listed under faculty section). A discussion ensued, much of it revisited, as to both the purpose and the format of the form. Brigitte Kouakou asked why there was the need for such
a form when the policy is spelled out in the catalogue and student handbook. Mike Absher explained that there is no formal process or record for student cheating from an administrative perspective. Stephanie Zappa explained that the idea was well-received and appreciated by the Language Arts Division as long as it remains optional; many new teachers and adjunct instructors are unsure about handling individual instances of cheating or plagiarism. Barbara Ogman stated that another value for the optional form is to offer some consistency to protect both the instructor and the student. Many students may be discouraged from cheating again if they see that there is a record of it that would be housed in the vice-president’s office. The discussion continued, with various anecdotes and scenarios from faculty; Nancy Cowan said that in the case of habitual cheating, it’s difficult to establish any sort of pattern and this may help address that. Mike Absher agreed with Chad that the addition of a dotted line to separate student from faculty sections on the form was needed. Bill Johnson argued strongly against the form, stating that it should be treated as a deposition and two separate forms should be used; students should not be allowed to read the faculty version, as it may “color” their own. Discussion returned to the purpose of the form; Barbara Ogman pointed out that it is not a legal document. Stephanie Zappa stated that it begins a paper trail and only the vice president has that record. Ron Taylor suggested that in the “Report and Process” instructions, specific language be used to delineate consequences. Faculty agreed that specific consequences should be spelled out by instructors in individual class syllabi. The question was called and the form adopted, as amended.

4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.1 Faculty Hiring Process The ad hoc committee, composed of Chad Mark Glen, Mike Absher, and Nancy Cowan, will bring some information to next week’s meeting.

4.2 Senate Reporting/Recommending Responsibilities in Shared Governance. The Senate still needs to decide whether and how to report directly to the president. Bill Johnson expressed dissatisfaction in the apparent bypass by the Chancellor’s Cabinet of the Senate’s recent work on the Program Discontinuance Policy, and stated that this indicates the Senate is, in fact, superfluous. President Glen stated that LPC was working on this process, and that the Chancellor had accepted the policy Chabot Senate crafted. Stephanie Zappa pointed out that it was 4:15 and time to adjourn, but that this discussion was too important to be rushed. In light of “real” budget cuts, due to the “real” crisis, we need time for the conversation and analysis in shared governance and the Senate’s role. Zappa suggested that we put this item first on the next agenda, and senate members agreed.
4.3 Board Policy On Copyright. President Glen pointed out that the Senate has had the draft policy to review for a number of weeks and recommended that the Board Policy on Copyright be an action item at the next meeting. Senators were asked to post the draft of the policy and elicit feedback from divisions.

4.4 Board Policy 2313 On Naming Buildings. As above, senators should post this draft as well for division feedback. A brief discussion ensued about the possibility that with a substantial enough donation, buildings could be named after corporations. As examples, a building could be named “Clorox” or worse, “Enron;” discussion is planned for next meeting.

4.5 Draft Board Policy on the Web. Concerns have been raised by the Faculty Association, which has asked that the matter be tabled. President Glen provided some background and Mike Absher said discussions have already gone on for a long time. Norman Buchwald said that the FA has wanted to negotiate a policy for some time, that many faculty members have web pages, and that the FA must participate due to the fact that it is a “working-conditions issue.” Mike Absher requested that Glen draft a request to FA for a list of key issues. Once such a request is fulfilled and senators receive it, they should post it and elicit input from their division, particularly key “tech” members. Glen will make that request and the item will be removed from next week’s agenda, to allow time for this process.

5.0 REPORTS. No Reports.

6.0 GOOD OF THE ORDER

6.1 Future Agenda Items.

6.2 Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

6.3 Next Meeting: Joint Classified Senate Meeting Thursday, December 8, 2005 at 2:15 p.m. Board Room.

6.4 Fall Meetings: 2nd & 4th Thursday, 2:15 - 4:15 p.m., unless designated “*special*. 12/15*.
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